

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons which follow.

Claims 1-29, 35, and 38 are cancelled. Claims 30, 34, 36, 37, and 43 are amended hereby. The changes to such claims find support in the claims, as previously filed, and in the specification, e.g., at Paragraphs [0052], [0077], and [0082]. Claim 43, for one, has been amended, in part, to improve the wording thereof. As such, no new issues are raised hereby.

With the foregoing amendments, claims 30-34, 36, 37, and 39-49 are pending in this application.

The Examiner is thanked for discussing the outstanding Final Office Action on October 20, 2008, including clarifying that claims 1-49 had intended to be rejected based upon the applied art (not just claims 1-33) and discussing the rationale behind the present prior art rejections.

Rejection under 35 USC § 102(b or e) and/or under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-33 (actually, 1-49, as per conversation of 10/20/08 with Exmr. Ackun) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b or e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Evans et al. (U.S. 6,641,031), Karow (U.S. 6,230,893), Johnstone et al. (U.S. 6,047,829), Tannenbaum (U.S. 5,244,091), Kelly (U.S. 4,817,819), or Kotyuk (U.S. 4,192,422). Applicant has amended claims 30, 34, 36, 37, and 43, has cancelled claims 1-29, 35, and 38, and submits that claims 30-34, 36, 37, and 39-49, in their current form, are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 30 recites in part:

... the interference mechanism further comprising a stop flap on the outer package and an interference stop on the blister card, the interference stop including at least one of an interference blister and a slotted and raised portion of the blister card, ...

Meanwhile, claim 43 recites in part:

a blister card for sliding into an outer package, the blister card having an interference stop associated therewith, ... the interference stop comprising at least one of an interference blister and a slotted and raised portion of the blister card; ...

a catch flap attached to the outer package,

wherein the interference stop and the catch flap together comprise an interference mechanism for preventing complete separation of the blister card and the outer package.

Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the subject matter of claims 30 or 43, as amended.

Evans et al. (e.g., Figs. 6-10) has a tray 170 with a releasable locking flap 179. Karow (e.g., Figs. 9-11) and Johnstone et al. (e.g., Figs. 9-11) each disclose an inner slide card 100 with an extension 106 that is able to interact with folded extensions 4 and 8 to prevent complete removal of the slide card 100 from the outer shell 50. Yet, none of these references discloses or suggests the provision of an interference blister and/or a slotted and raised portion as the interference stop, as per claims 30 and/or 43.

Tannenbaum (e.g., Figs. 1-6) discloses a device for inhibiting removal of an article from a blister container. The locking member of the device uses protuberances 76 mounted on a foldable second member 66. Such protuberances may selectively snap fit within either the first or second openings 70, 68 to lock the blisters 44 in a position that will selectively permit or prevent access thereto. However, Tannenbaum does not even disclose an outer package. Accordingly, Tannenbaum clearly fails to teach or suggest a flap attached thereto, in the manner of claims 30 or 43.

Kelly (e.g., Fig. 3) and Kotyuk (e.g., Figs. 1, 2, and 17) disclose pill containers slidably mounted in an outer package. In both, a pair of opposed stops are provided at the sides of the blister card/tablet tray. Such stops are essentially aligned within the plane of the card/tray and are directed away therefrom to allow engagement with the related package. Kelly and Kotyuk each fail to teach or suggest an interference stop in the form of an interference blister and/or a slotted and raised portion, as per claims 30 or 43.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 30, 43, and those claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance over the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 34 recites in part:

... the card comprising an interference stop comprising an interference blister, and the outer package comprising a flap configured ... to contact the interference stop to releasably lock the card in the outer package, ...

Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the subject matter of claim 34, as amended.

None of Evans et al. (e.g., Figs. 6-10), Karow (e.g., Figs. 9-11), and Johnstone et al. (e.g., Figs. 9-11) discloses or suggests the provision of an interference blister, as per claim 34.

Tannenbaum (e.g., Figs. 1-6) discloses a device for inhibiting removal of an article from a blister container. The locking member of the device uses protuberances 76 mounted on a foldable second member 66. Such protuberances may selectively snap fit within either the first or second openings 70, 68 to lock the blisters 44 in a position that will selectively permit or prevent access thereto. However, Tannenbaum does not even disclose an outer package. Accordingly, Tannenbaum clearly fails to teach or suggest a flap attached thereto, in the manner of claim 34.

Kelly (e.g., Fig. 3) and Kotyuk (e.g., Figs. 1, 2, and 17) disclose pill containers slidably mounted in an outer package. In both, a pair of opposed stops are provided at the sides of the blister card/tablet tray. Such stops are essentially aligned within the plane of the card/tray and are directed away therefrom to allow engagement with the related package. Kelly and Kotyuk each fail to teach or suggest an interference stop in the form of an interference blister, as per claim 34.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 34 and those claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance over the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance.
Favorable consideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fees to 132512. If a fee is required for an extension of time under CFR § 1.136 that is not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey T. Knapp/
Jeffrey T. Knapp
Registration No.: 45,384
Agent for Applicants
Telephone No. (919) 334-3374

MeadWestvaco Corporation
Law Department
1021 Main Campus Drive
Raleigh, NC 27606
E-mail: jeff.knapp@mwv.com
Telephone: (919) 334-3374
Facsimile: (919) 834-0844